

It is not surprising at this time that the Government asks for really extraordinary powers in an attempt to recoup some of these lost millions of dollars. I am sure there must be the odd Member of the Conservative Government who is somewhat embarrassed because, after all, the Conservative Party made a big to-do about the injustices and inequities of some of the tactics being employed when the Liberals were in power. I think a fair number of them want to see some honest reform and changes in Revenue Canada and in the tax collection procedure. With this particular Bill, they have had to revert to some of the Gestapo tactics used in the past.

I understand the Government needs some extraordinary powers in order to save some of those lost revenues. Every day we read about another scandal. In today's *Globe and Mail* there was an article about two computer companies. One company was apparently from somewhere in the United States. It set up a dummy company in Canada with a Canadian front person and was able to collect millions of dollars in tax credits from the federal Government. Apparently, the whole thing was a total scam. The Government wants these extraordinary powers in order to be able to go out and collect as much of that money it can before the money flees the country. We cannot oppose the Government on that. The more money the Government can recover from that program, the better it is. However, the point I want to make is that it was a scandalous program to begin with. The Tory half cure of October 10, 1984, did not help matters at all. We are now faced with giving the Government in this particular instance those extraordinary powers. It is a sad situation. It is sad for the Government, it is sad for Parliament and it is sad for the country. I do not think there will be much debate on this matter nor do I think there will be much disagreement, but I did feel it important that these points be raised in debate.

● (1530)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Charest): Questions or comments? Debate? Is the House ready for the question?

Some Hon. Members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Charest): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: On division.

Motion agreed to and Bill read the third time and passed.

* * *

COMPETITION TRIBUNAL ACT

MEASURE TO ENACT

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C-91, an Act to establish the Competition Tribunal and to amend the Combines Investigation Act and the Bank Act and other Acts

in consequence thereof, as reported (with amendments) from a legislative committee.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Charest): As Hon. Members are aware, there are 14 report stage motions on the Notice Paper in amendment to Bill C-91, an Act to establish the Competition Tribunal and to amend the Combines Investigation Act and the Bank Act and other Acts in consequence thereof. Motions Nos. 1, 2 and 6 were moved and negatived in committee. After reviewing the committee proceedings, the Chair will select Motion No. 6 and Motions Nos. 1 and 2 will be dropped from the Notice Paper.

Motions Nos. 4 and 5 attempt to reach into the parent Act and appear to be beyond the scope of the Bill. It would be my intention to rule these motions out of order. Therefore, Motions Nos. 1 and 2 are not selected. Motion No. 3 will be debated and voted on separately. Motions Nos. 4 and 5 give the Chair procedural difficulty.

Motions Nos. 6, 7 and 8 will be debated and voted on separately. Motions Nos. 9 and 10 will be grouped for debate but voted on separately. Motions Nos. 11 and 12 will be debated and voted on separately. Motions Nos. 13 and 14 will be combined for debate. A vote on Motion No. 13 will be applied to Motion No. 14.

If Hon. Members wish to make procedural arguments on Motions Nos. 4 and 5, it would be my intention to hear such arguments when those motions would otherwise be called.

Mr. John R. Rodriguez (for Mr. Orlikow) moves:

Motion No. 3

That Bill C-91, be amended in Clause 21 by striking out lines 33 to 35 at page 9 and substituting the following therefor:

"persons but not in respect of commercial activities engaged in by the corporation that are subject to specific regulation under federal or provincial statute."

He said: The purpose for introducing this particular amendment is to ensure that operations that fall under provincial regulatory bodies would remain outside the purview of this Act. When the Bill was in committee, it was suggested by departmental advisers that the existing jurisprudence with respect to this matter supported the view that provincial regulatory bodies would be outside the Combines Investigation Act under the regulated conduct exemption. We accepted the Government's legal opinion, but why not put in writing what the Government so obviously intends?

We have attempted to put forward an amendment that spells out the intentions of the Government. Our amendment would ensure that provincially or federally-regulated Crown corporations would continue to answer to their own regulatory authorities as it pertains to competition issues. For example, the Manitoba Telephone Company is regulated by provincial regulations and by federal regulations. Therefore, this particular Act ought not to supersede those regulations that are in force and provide protection for consumers.